## EXHIBIT 3

Ī			$\neg$
1	EASTERN D	1 TES DISTRICT COURT ISTRICT OF TEXAS	-
2	SHERMAN DIVISION		
3	RESMAN, LLC	: DOCKET NO. 4:19CV402	
4	VS.	: SHERMAN, TEXAS	
5		: :	
6	KARYA PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SCARLET INFOTECH, INC.	: 10:00 A.M.	
7			
8	PRETRIAL HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE AMOS L. MAZZANT, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
9		ES DISTRICT GODGE	
10	APPEARANCES:		
11	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	MS. MARIA WYCKOFF BOYCE MS. CRISTINA ESPINOSA RODRIGUEZ	
12		MS. JILLIAN C. BECK MR. LEE WHITESELL	
13		MR. IRA JAMSHIDI MS. SYDNEY RUPE	
14		MS. JENNIFER BEVILACQUA HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP	
15		609 MAIN STREET SUITE 4200	
16		HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002	
17		MR. MIKE E. JONES POTTER MINTON	
18		110 N. COLLEGE, SUITE 500 TYLER, TEXAS 75702	
19		11111( <b>,</b> 1111110 15102	
20	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	MR. MICHAEL ERNEST RICHARDSON MR. SEEPAN PARSEGHIAN	
		BECK REDDEN, LLP	
21		1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 4500 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77010	
22		MR. RICHARD ALAN SAYLES	
23		MR. MARK DANIEL STRACHAN BRADLEY ARANT BOULT CUMMINGS	
24		4400 RENAISSANCE TOWER 1201 ELM STREET	
25		DALLAS, TEXAS 75270	

1 THE COURT: Response? 2 MR. WHITESELL: Your Honor, Lee Whitesell again for 3 Plaintiffs. I think a lot of this angst is probably the result of 4 5 just overbroad drafting of this MIL. The way that it's 6 worded is evidence, testimony, attorney argument or other 7 comments regarding the Court's preliminary injunction, TRO 8 or any other court order. So we had to object to that to 9 the extent that it could be read to preclude us from 10 entering some of the same evidence that was used. 11 THE COURT: Well, clearly, the evidence, argument and 12 all that is -- and Mr. Sayles even admitted that. He's not precluding that, even though that's the way it's worded. 13 14 That's true that's too broad. 15 MR. WHITESELL: We appreciate that. 16 THE COURT: Are you trying to get it into -- let me 17 make sure I understand any additional argument. You're not 18 trying to discuss that the injunction was issued? 19 MR. WHITESELL: No, Your Honor. And we would be fine 20 with a chastened version of this that just precludes the 21 parties from referring to the Court's preliminary injunction 22 without first approaching the bench. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Then I can go ahead and grant that 24 as modified and make it mutual.

MR. SAYLES: Yes.

25